١		1	
		•	
1 2	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION		
3	BRIANNA McCARTY,	Docket No. 22 C 5751	
4	4 Plaintiff,	Chicago, Illinois	
5	5 v.	October 17, 2023 10:29 a.m.	
6	6 THE VILLAGE OF LAKEMOOR,		
7	7 Defendant. )		
8		TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - Rule to Show Cause	
9	BEFORE THE HONORABLE	BEFORE THE HONORABLE MARY M. ROWLAND	
10	O APPEARANCES:	APPEARANCES:	
11	1		
12	Herbert Law Fi	Herbert Law Firm	
13	Suite 964		
14		0604	
15	For the Defendant: MR. DOMINICK L. LANZITO		
16	200 W. Adams S	Peterson Johnson & Murray LLC 200 W. Adams Street	
17	Suite 2125 Chicago, IL 60606		
18		CCD DND CDD	
19 20	Official Court	LAURA R. RENKE, CSR, RDR, CRR Official Court Reporter 219 S. Dearborn Street, Room 1224	
21	Chicago, IL 60	Chicago, IL 60604 312.435.6053	
22	laura_renke@il	laura_renke@ilnd.uscourts.gov	
23			
24			
25	5		
	II		

```
1
          (In open court.)
 2
               THE CLERK: 22 C 5751, McCarty v. Village of Lakemoor.
 3
               THE COURT:
                           Good morning.
 4
               MR. HERBERT: Good morning. How are you, your Honor?
 5
      My name is Dan Herbert, and I represent the plaintiff,
 6
      Ms. McCarty.
               MR. LANZITO: Good morning, your Honor. Dominick
 7
 8
      Lanzito, L-A-N-Z-I-T-O, on behalf of defendant.
 9
               THE COURT: Good morning.
10
               Okay.
11
               MR. LANZITO: I -- oh. I can report on the motion,
      your Honor.
12
13
               THE COURT: Okay.
                                  The --
14
               MR. LANZITO: This is our motion --
15
               THE COURT: About the deposition?
16
               MR. LANZITO: Yes, your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: Okay.
18
               MR. LANZITO: So Attorney Baron Harmon contacted us on
19
      behalf of Dr. Kroll. We've scheduled it for October 23rd at
20
      3:00 p.m. Apparently she was not in the office, and whoever
21
      her assistant was was not returning or provid -- forwarding
22
      e-mails.
23
               THE COURT:
                           Okay.
24
               MR. LANZITO: So we have the documents that were part
25
      of our subpoena duces tecum, and we also have the date set for
```

next Monday.

THE COURT: Okay. Great.

MR. LANZITO: So I would just ask to enter and continue it generally.

THE COURT: Okay. That's fine.

Yeah, I didn't think she would be uncooperative. I mean, she's given everything to the village anyway -- right? -- as a -- I mean, for some period of time she was operating -- at least from the motion to dismiss, I recall, she was operating as a -- not the village's therapist, but she would still provide information to the village based upon the plaintiff's signing off on that for some period of time.

Now, obviously that probably terminated at some point. But  $\operatorname{--}$ 

MR. LANZITO: I believe she's still treating Brianna Tedesco -- or McCarty. She began treatment, and she also provided certificate of dis -- ongoing certificate of disability for the pension in 2022. So you are accurate in that she is Ms. McCarty's therapist.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LANZITO: And she was reporting to the village from time to time on accommodation requests.

THE COURT: Okay. So petition for rule to show cause.

I'll continue it. And do you want to just withdraw it at some point, or do you want to --

MR. LANZITO: Once we're done --1 2 THE COURT: -- just report back? 3 MR. LANZITO: -- I'll just report back. I have all belief that we're just going to -- it will be withdrawn. 4 THE COURT: When it's done. 5 6 MR. LANZITO: Yes. And I already explained to the 7 attorney I would relay to the Court. 8 And then we're supposed to be in front of you next 9 Thursday at 9:30 to report on status. 10 THE COURT: That doesn't seem smart. 11 MR. LANZITO: That's why I brought it up, your Honor. 12 It was just -- you set it before, and we have deps coming up on 13 discovery. THE COURT: Yeah. So why don't we move that date. 14 15 MR. LANZITO: All right, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Because you're going to do this deposition on Monday, and then you have other deps coming up. 17 18 When is the close of discovery? 19 MR. LANZITO: I believe it's the end of the month. 20 But we have three this week, the doctor, and I think we're 21 trying to do two next week and maybe one the week after. 22 THE COURT: So do you want to move our status to the 23 3rd of November or even later in November? 24 MR. HERBERT: I would suggest later, your Honor, only 25 because we have the motion to dismiss the counterclaim, and I

think that -- that responses aren't until -- or my reply wouldn't be until mid-November, I believe.

THE COURT: Yeah, okay. So why don't we do that. Why don't we move it. I have a couple of trials set. So -- boy, Dawn, the 21st is going to get very ugly.

Why don't we move it to November 21st. Dawn, do you want to do it at 9:00? Should we --

THE CLERK: Sure.

THE COURT: Yeah, that's going to get ugly that day.

MR. LANZITO: I'm available.

THE COURT: Okay. Great.

MR. LANZITO: And, your Honor, speaking of the motion to dismiss, that may impact our motion for summary judgment as well.

THE COURT: Well, I was going to talk more broadly about the case. I know you're wrapping up discovery. And I knew you had your issue with the doctor, which I think is why I set today. So I'll strike the status for next week.

But -- so I'm wondering if there's a way that we can -- once discovery closes, you're going to want to file a motion for summary judgment, I know. You've got now a motion to dismiss, which for me, just with my schedule, I'm going to look at those -- basically, I'm going to look at them at the same time because by the time this gets -- this gets briefed and then your motion for summary judgment gets briefed, I'm not

going to get to the motion to dismiss until -- by the time I get to it, your motion for summary judgment is going to be briefed is my thinking.

And I'm just wondering if there's a way -- and I know this has been very hotly contested. And I understand why the village would be concerned that Ms. McCarty would -- would, you know -- did she get disability --

MR. HERBERT: She did, yes.

THE COURT: -- or pension? Yes, so that she would go and get disability and then pursue an ADA claim. And she may -- you may get summary judgment.

If she gets -- if summary judgment is denied -- you know, if she were to win a claim -- of course, there'd have to be some -- she can't double -- she can't get a double award, right?

MR. HERBERT: Agreed.

THE COURT: So I don't know how that would work, technically how that would work. But if she were to win on an ADA claim, she can't get past back wages.

MR. LANZITO: No, she's getting a full duty disability pension. She would receive full PEDA benefits.

Our position is that in order for her to win on an ADA claim, that means she has to be able to do the job with a reasonable accommodation, which would mean that our claim would be valid then and we would be entitled to reimbursement. So

now you're dealing with competing claims.

THE COURT: So she would have to pay that money back or it would have to be deducted from any jury award of back pay. And whether or not -- of course, there'd be in limine motions. There'd be questions -- were she to survive summary judgment, there'd be questions about would the jury hear that she was awarded disability for purposes of mitigation so that they could take that into account in terms of a damages award, or would they not hear about it and that's just a mathematical matter that we would take up if she were awarded back pay.

But she certainly couldn't be paid twice. There's no doubt about that, I think, in all of our minds.

So what I'm suggesting is, you know, she may have been harassed, and some of this -- do you have a gender claim as well, or is it just --

MR. HERBERT: We have a gender claim, yes, because -THE COURT: Okay. So some of this may have happened.

I don't know. I mean, I can't possibly know.

But I'm just -- I'm just wondering about whether this case is getting a little off the rails. And I say that because I -- the first time around on the motion to dismiss, I had a Rule 11 motion. I -- now I have your motion to dismiss, and I have another Rule 11 motion.

So -- and I know I have two very good lawyers in front of me. I know you. We've had some matters before, so I've

dealt with you professionally before. And I  $\operatorname{\mathsf{I}}$  -- and I know no lawyer likes filing Rule 11 motions.

So I'm just -- I'm wondering if there's a way to kind of -- I don't know -- kind of calm the waters here a little bit because she, obviously, did her job, and then things went off the rails for her through no fault of her own. I think everybody agrees. And I'm just wondering if there's a different way to handle this.

I'm happy to rule on the motions for summary judgment.

I'm happy to rule on the motion to dismiss. Maybe I'll throw
the whole case out. Maybe we'll go to a jury.

But even if she gets to a jury, she can't be compensated twice on the back pay. That I know.

Now, of course, she could seek compensatory damages, and I guess she could seek some punitive damages if she's got a sex harassment claim. I can't remember what all her claims are.

But is there a way to kind of tone this down and maybe try to resolve it? Or is -- are we just so dug in? And I respect you if you are. I got very dug in on cases myself, so I have no qualms about that. But I'm seeing what's happening, and I'm just wondering if it's a good -- if it's a good path for the clients.

MR. HERBERT: From the plaintiff's perspective, your Honor, with respect to your points about looking at she can't

collect twice, we agree. But my understanding is that the pension is -- it's not quite what her full pay would be. But, obviously, yes, it's close, and she wouldn't be compensated for it.

What I will say is that my client is a -- she is very reasonable, very smart. She was angered at being terminated, obviously, because it was a job that she loved. And it really bothered her.

We have not discussed settlement because from the outset of this case, it has been nothing but attack mode on my client. And nothing against counsel, who's been professional all the way through, but she has been attacked.

And so we haven't -- we haven't even had an opportunity to consider some type of a reasonable outcome. But I can report that, you know, I've represented a lot of clients, and she is a very, very nice person and reasonable. And I would think that she would be amenable to something.

THE COURT: I don't know that we're even -- I wouldn't -- I wouldn't think, what I'm seeing, another Rule 11 motion, that we're at a point of settlement. I mean, I think it's too hot right now to talk about that.

And I want to say I understand why the village would be angry that somebody would come in and get disability pay and then file a lawsuit. And I don't know the chronology of that. But I understand that. And I saw your motion giving me the

transcripts where she said, "Yes, I can't do my job." I see it.

I actually looked for another case where that might have happened because I -- I don't know if it -- there must be other cases where that's happened --

MR. LANZITO: Not where --

THE COURT: -- where there's ADA.

MR. LANZITO: Not where the case has been sustained.

THE COURT: Okay. So, you know, and you might prevail on summary judgment. I might be wrong about that. I was accepting their theory, which is she could have done it with an accommodation, meaning she could have been on desk duty for five years, done her therapy, and then gone out and --

MR. LANZITO: That's -- yeah, that's the disagreement, on what the accommodation. That's a department of 13 officers.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LANZITO: Yeah.

THE COURT: So, you know, here we are.

And I -- you know, there's going to be evidentiary calls, frankly, for a jury to hear that, hey, she got full disability. You know, what's the jury going to think about that? You know, so I -- I can see the challenges here.

Maybe one thing we think about doing -- and I don't know where your people are at, and sometimes the chief of police leaves and so other people come in and they're, like,

"Hey, let's" -- you know, so I don't know what's happening in Lakemoor.

But maybe what we do is you finish up discovery and then you come in and say, "Let's not set summary judgment until the new year. Let's let everybody chill and revisit it." I'm not -- we don't have to do that. I'm happy to set summary judgment today, you know. But maybe that's an avenue, that everybody go through the holidays and kind of think is this where we want to go.

I'm not trying to force you to settle. I don't -it's fine with me if you do motions. It's -- we can set a
trial. But I am just wondering about the wisdom of this, I
guess, partly for the plaintiff.

And I know that she was a good officer at one point, so I do have some respect for that, and I'm sure the village thinks that at some point given what I've read in the papers. And then, you know, obviously things went south.

But I'm just really reacting to two Rule 11 motions in a case, and that's not the norm.

MR. LANZITO: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yeah. So why don't we come back at the status. You guys finish up your discovery. Hopefully the doctor will cooperate and that won't be a problem.

And then you tell me what you want to do. And if you want to take a break, let things cool off, if you want to try

to sit down with the magistrate judge or with me, I'm happy to 1 2 try to do that. If you want to go full steam ahead, I'm happy to do that. You let me know. Okay? 3 4 MR. LANZITO: Understood, your Honor. So we have a next date. So we'll 5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 strike next week, and we'll see you in a couple months -- or a 7 month. 8 MR. LANZITO: A month, yeah. 9 MR. HERBERT: Great. Thank you, Judge. 10 MR. LANZITO: Thank you, your Honor. 11 Thanks for the consideration and the MR. HERBERT: 12 analysis. 13 THE COURT: Have a good day. Yeah, have a good day. 14 This court stands in recess. THE CLERK: 15 (Concluded at 10:42 a.m.) 16 CERTIFICATE 17 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the 18 record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. 19 20 /s/ LAURA R. RENKE October 27, 2023 LAURA R. RENKE, CSR, RDR, CRR 21 Official Court Reporter 22 23 24 25